

their roles as responsible members of a democratic country?

These are some of the questions and difficulties that confront India today. But no list is complete that does not include the problem of Communist China. India and China are the two great rivals in Asia. In their development both countries have started at about the same time at the same level. But in their approaches to development there has been a great contrast. Will India and the democratic path to development that it follows produce results as fast as the Chinese Communist totalitarian rule? The leaders in both countries know that the stakes in the contest are very high. The other countries of Asia and the rest of the developing world are watching closely to see whether India or China succeeds best in handling the problems of progress. The outcome will have a profound impact on the future.

The interest of the United States in India centers on the question of whether or not India can remain outside the Communist bloc and can achieve growth and prosperity as a democracy. As the leader of the democratic world, the United States must be sensitive to the needs of the people of India. In the past the United States has contributed generously to India's development. This country should continue to do what it can to help the world's most populous democracy along the path of progress.

Castro Strangles Cuba's Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, on August 7, 1963, Radio Havana beamed a propaganda broadcast in English to Europe which it described as an interview of certain students from the United States who made an unauthorized trip to Cuba and accepted the hospitality of the Castro government.

While the broadcast comments of the students were generally favorable to the Castro regime, it was interesting to note that their comments confirmed the repression of press freedom. These students from the United States seemingly saw little cause for concern in this, and several accepted the mission of the Cuban press as a government instrument to educate and unite the people as reasonable and proper. They suggested, in fact, that press criticism of the regime could not be expected, anyway, because there was so little anti-Castro sentiment on the Cuban island.

It is most regrettable that these students should lend themselves to the propaganda effort of the Soviet-directed Communist dictatorship which has enslaved the Cuban people and made of the island a base for subversive excursions against the free republics of the hemisphere. Their willingness to assist in the attempt to justify press manipulation by the

Castro government serves to recall, however, the methodical strangulation of Cuba's channels of free information.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I should like to include an article which appeared in the June 1963, issue of *Author and Journalist*, a magazine published in Denver, Colo. The article, which follows, was written by George Holcomb, a member of the editorial staff of the Bureau of National Affairs, Inc., Washington, D.C., who also is active as a freelance writer, particularly on matters related to the techniques of the world Communist conspiracy:

AND THE FREE PRESS WAS DEAD

(By George Holcomb)

Cuba's free press did not die in silence in 1960. Fragile though she was, she screamed and fought as the hammer rained blow after blow upon her and the sickle relentlessly ripped out her vitals. She cried out to the world in her mortal agony, but the neighbors all around would not hear. She expired alone.

Why? What was the world press doing during those lost free moments of the Cuban press? Where were the correspondents of the U.S. magazines and press associations and giant dailies?

Writing of the assassination of Cuba's free press, I see her blood staining the hands of every free journalist who was there when it happened but did not let us know. How many saw, heard, spoke of no evil, until the deed was done?

There are many ways to sap the life out of a free press, and Fidel Castro and his Communist and fellow opportunists used most of them. The methods are always alike, whether used by Fascists, Communists, Nazis, opportunists, politicians, quislings, or what have you.

First and foremost is the method of intimidation used against newsboys, drivers, reporters, newscasters, editors, typographers, artists, publishers, advertisers, readers, television viewers, legislators, foreign correspondents, and government officials. Different means of intimidation are used against different types of persons.

Name calling was the most common weapon. Any writer who charged that Communists were moving into Castro's government was repeatedly smeared as irresponsible, an extremist, as a former hireling of Fulgencia Batista, a Fascist, as a current hireling of the U.S. State Department or the "sia"—CIA (Central Intelligence Agency), and finally as a promoter of counterrevolution. Perhaps, indeed, some of the smears were not smears; perhaps some of the name calling was truthful. But it made no difference, obviously not to the principal smear artists, such as Fidel and his little brother Raul, who liked to wear his hair long.

There are many other methods of intimidation, and they were used. Mobs were organized outside radio stations and newspaper plants from which offending words had come. Newsboys were beaten. Newstrucks were sabotaged. Papers were stolen and burned. Rocks were hurled, windows broken. Pickets were active. Mock burials of newspapers were conducted by parading activists. Effigies of writers and publishers were hung and burned. Advertisers were threatened, stoned, boycotted. Employees were forced to choose between loyalty to their employer or to their Communist-led unions, and they were pressured and browbeaten until they either turned against their employer or quit jobs in defeat and frustration. And then there was blackmail. And confiscation by the revolution.

It began the very day Batista fled the island, January 1, 1959. Although the sudden departure reportedly surprised Castro, he ob-

viously had plans ready for immediate action with regard to the press.

Before the end of the day, armed men took over five daily Havana newspapers and some radio stations. Who was to object? They had been identified as Batista papers and stations. Similar outright and lawless confiscations took place in other cities.

Also on that same day, the Communist Party daily, *Hoy*, resumed publication in the city of Santiago de Cuba. This publication had been stolen from the Cuban Confederation of Labor some years earlier, but the confederation officials were not ready to assert their claim. Only the Communists were prepared. *Hoy's* editor: Communist Carlos Rafael Rodriguez.

Thus, before Castro entered Havana triumphantly on January 8, he already had several important press outlets grinding out propaganda for him. One of the stolen Batista dailies was renamed *Revolution*, and Castro designated it as his official publication, spokesman for his 26th of July movement. Its editor: Communist Carlos Franqui. Thereafter Franqui attended Castro's Cabinet meetings.

Castro also had ready access to television, and he made frequent use of TV as he discovered how effective were his speeches. He easily matches Mussolini and Hitler in demagoguery.

The bearded leader was now ready to manage the news in several ways: By feeding handouts to favored publications; by permitting only reporters for the Communist papers to have access to government offices—to police, military, and judicial areas; by openly demonstrating his pique about articles which did not please him; and by monopolizing a considerable amount of television time as a means of creating a mob psychology in his favor.

Two days after he arrived in Havana, Castro announced he was clearing the path for the "Communists to act as a legal party," using the name of "Popular Socialist Party."

Daniel James, author of the well-researched "Cuba—First Soviet Satellite in the Americas," noted that the only party Castro legalized was the Communist and said:

"More incredible, in a sense, than Fidel Castro's brazen show of partisanship in favor of the Cuban Communist Party was the fact that no powerful voices were raised against this act."

But this was the executive of the nation. There was no Congress to counter his power. The judiciary was in no position to oppose him; already he was setting up "people's courts" to try persons singled out as Batistianos, especially to the military. The military forces, however, were divided and disorganized. Ultimately, Castro destroyed the organized military forces, since they represented the only possible group that could copy with the paramilitary might of the Communists and their allies who thought Fidel could do no evil.

It has been estimated that at least 60 men, including several army officers, were sent a pardon—to the wall—for execution that night of January 10, 1959, in the Havana area alone. For many there was not even the formality of a trial. Their bodies were covered by use of a bulldozer.

Who could dare to raise a voice against Fidel and the Communists under such circumstances?

But the circumstances were soon to grow worse, as Fidel used various tactics popularized by misguided or unethical trade unionists. For example, Castro addressed a union rally and attacked a weekly publication, *Zig Zag*, which had published an editorial cartoon showing a number of bureaucrats who had been Batista sycophants in the past but who now were trailing a parade led by Fidel. He also reportedly criticized Jorge Zayas, publisher of *Avance*, a major Havana daily.

What was wrong with this? Castro said he would never engage in censorship of the press, since there were other ways to handle it. He mentioned the boycott.

Carlos Todd, then editor of the Times of Havana, has reported that he alone among the many editors in the city expressed concern about Castro's obvious hypocrisy and attempt to censor the press while saying he would never censor the press.

What harm in a boycott? Didn't the Bostonians do worse in protest against a certain tea tax nearly 2 centuries ago? But there is a difference. On the one hand you have the head of a government trying to use his vast powers to reduce dissent, to create a one-party machine, a state-run political monopoly. The Communists call it "monolithic unity," or the use of "discipline." On the other hand you have the Bostonians protesting the use of monopoly powers by the government of King George.

Before going any further with this, we might well pause and ask ourselves whether we, under similar circumstances, would recognize the early phases of a takeover by a totalitarian-minded regime? What are some touchstones of democracy? I believe there are at least four, which I've tussled with considerably so as to make them as meaningful as possible: (1) Even the least amongst us is free of coercive influences; (2) at decisionmaking times, the use of a secret ballot which affords ample opportunity for dissent is automatic; (3) everyone amply and equally has easy access to truly competitive points of view before making decisions; (4) every adult has freedom of choice between at least two openly opposing factions during the regular selection of government executives and legislators. Perhaps a fifth should deal with certain basic rights of which no one may be deprived even by government, but I believe this is covered under the first point.

On January 29, 1959, Humberto Medrano, an editor of the Prensa Libre, published by his father-in-law, wrote an article recalling that in the famous Castro Manifesto of the Sierra Maestra dated July 12, 1957, Castro had promised his provisional government would be based on "absolute guarantee of freedom of information of the press . . . and of all individual and political rights guaranteed by the Constitution" of 1940.

The response was indirect, and hindsight shows it was part of the intimidation strategy. The Castro mouthpiece, *Revolucion* published an exclusive scoop—a list of names of writers and others on an undated unsigned sheet of stationery of the kind used by Batista. *Revolucion* stated as a fact that this was a list of persons who had been on Batista's payroll. The Big Lie technique.

Todd later reported that the "delirious and credulous people of Cuba" accepted the statement from the Communist-run newspaper as "gospel truth." Hitler, Mussolini, and others often used such tactics which they picked up from their associations with Marxists and Machiavellians.

But if the Cuban non-Communist editors were too numb to question the Big Lie, still, they were getting somehow uncomfortable. Sergio Carbo, publisher and editor of *Prensa Libre*, and the editors of *El Diario de la Marina*, published by Jose Ignacio Rivero, began suggesting it was time to prepare for the free elections so long acclaimed by Fidel.

This time the response was more undisciplined than ever before. At a gigantic open gathering in the Plaza of the Alameda de Paula, Fidel Castro flourished copies of *Prensa Libre* and the *Diario* and shouted forth his displeasure. They were trying to undermine the prestige of the "revolution," he charged with great apparent emotion. He seemed especially incensed at Carbo's questioning the mass dismissals of Government employees in certain key departments.

Carbo has said that months later he recognized why Castro had reacted so sensitive-

ly: Communists were being brought in to fill some of the vacancies resulting from the mass layoffs or discharges. Castro obviously was trying to cover up.

Castro's denunciations were carried live on radio and television throughout Cuba. Many Cubans expressed shocked anger at the publishers for having suggested that Fidel was not a great patriot giving his all for his people. Here and there, it is said, some Cubans were troubled by Fidel's attack on the publishers. But these were the gentler folk, who kept their mouths shut. This was in March 1959.

El Diario, an open advocate of private enterprise and, even, of profits, had survived 127 years, through many dictatorships. It had been owned by Rivero's family since 1895. Occasionally it opened its columns to Lopez Fresquet, Castro's Minister of Finance. It was conservative but hardly anti-revolution.

Even so, it was a major obstacle to the state-press monopoly toward which Castro was driving. He brought Lazaro Pena and other experienced Communist labor agents to Havana. The Communist Pena had headed the labor federation for Batista some years earlier.

The labor agents moved cautiously, for they did not control the unions at this time. A few months of preparation were needed.

By July 9, 1959, Castro was ready with his "Code of Special Defense." He explained its necessity. The "revolution" was being endangered by critics whose intentions were evil. The code contained many provisions, such as a couple which would enable Castro lawfully to execute any writer or broadcaster found guilty of inciting "counter-revolutionary crimes" resulting in deaths.

Article 149 said "whoever shall introduce, publish, propagate, or try to control in Cuba any dispatch, order, or decree which tends to impair the independence of the nation or encourage nonobservance of the laws in effect" was subject to imprisonment for from 6 to 18 years. Who could object to a law in favor of "independence"?

Article 156 said "the incitement, carried out publicly, of feelings that may lead to the commission of some of the counter-revolutionary crimes noted in articles 128, 147, 148, and 149 shall be punished by imprisonment of from 10 to 20 years. But if, as a direct or indirect consequence of that incitement, acts of violence result against the revolutionary government in which lives are lost, the penalty shall be from 20 years' imprisonment to death."

On September 28, 1959, Castro in one of his television spectacles charged three writers of *Avance* with being guilty of writing "counter-revolutionary" articles. But he did not move to prosecute.

He didn't need to; some of the writers and editors could take the hint, and they began the exodus from Cuba that will continue so long as Castro finds it convenient to expel rather than to kill the gusanos—the worms, those who do not cooperate willfully.

By November, the Communists with Fidel's open, direct, and personal intervention managed to force a united-front management upon the main labor confederation, despite what has been described as the overwhelming opposition of delegates at the crucial convention. The tactics of some unionists, the obtaining of monopoly control over a labor force and the use of that monopoly to prevent competition by "dissidents," were strangely identical to those of the Communists. How could the non-Communists object to giving the Communists an equal opportunity to participate? Weren't they for fairplay?

This fairplay ploy soon appeared in another form. On January 11, 1960, Fidel opened the New Year with a major speech. Once again he denounced the privately owned press and announced that henceforth all press association articles permitted to

circulate by sufferance of his Government must—in the interest of fairplay—be accompanied by statements of "clarification" of any facts or opinions deemed not in the public interest.

The *Prensa Libre*, biggest Havana daily, promptly labeled the "clarifications" as "coletillas," or postscripts.

Who wrote the coletillas? By now Fidel felt this duty could be performed by certain loyal followers who were beginning to run the newspaper unions.

Some publishers, notably Jorge Zayas of *Avance*, refused to run the coletillas. Zayas had been recalcitrant for some time. Thus, one time when he returned home from a trip to the United States, he had been detained and questioned by the police.

The right of private ownership and control of a newspaper was at stake. Did the unions, acting with the consent and encouragement of the government, have the right to dictate what the publishers should print?

"Yes," said the Communists; it was in the public interest and was part of the right of freedom of choice and of fairplay. No publisher should be the sole judge of what he published; the unions equally had the right to determine how their product was used, insisted the Communists.

On January 18, 1960, according to Zayas' report, a mob of printers—members of the graphic arts union—marched on *Avance* and took possession of it in the name of the "revolution." The leader of the mob was Communist Dagoberto Ponce. Zayas wisely fled, the first of the major publishers to be driven into exile.

Does the tale grow too long? Do the details bore you? Well, suffice to say, about the same tactics soon brought down all but the two biggest dailies: *Prensa Libre* and *El Diario de la Marina*.

By June 1960 the coletilla directive had been extended to every publication, to every article circulated in public, in the public interest.

The association of journalists, the news reporters' union, was now headed by Communist Tirso Martinez. If any publisher refused to publish a coletilla demanded by the association of journalists or by the graphic arts union, he could be charged with provoking a strike by locking out his employees.

After all, jobs were growing scarce in the business, what with the folding of so many newspapers, so a publisher would be quite an ogre to refuse to publish copy produced by his own employees, now, wouldn't he?

Now the parades of unionists carrying coffins labeled "*Prensa Libre*" and "*Diario*" became common.

Yet nearly 80 percent of *Prensa's* staff signed a bold statement supporting the publishers right to private property. So, the next day they were called to a major union meeting, presided over by David Salvador himself, head of the Labor Confederation. It is reported that for 7 consecutive hours the *Prensa* workers were harangued and badgered until they finally agreed to sign a statement pledging first loyalty to the union rather than to their employer. Otherwise, they could be smeared as "finks."

A similar situation hit *Diario*. A letter of support for the publisher's rights to publish was signed by some 400 *Diario* employees.

Editor Jose Ignacio Rivero has reported that he decided to publish the *Diario* employees' letter, and he sent it to the composing room for preparation. Some time later, while at lunch, he received a frantic call to return to the plant. He arrived to find 20 unionists using hammers to destroy the plate on which the letter had been cast.

Shaken but not intimidated, Rivero ordered the casting of another cylinder, and he stood by until he saw the presses begin their run. Finally, he went home.

August 15

rugged terrain and dense rain forest, crosses 92 bridges, and passes through 21 tunnels.

The Congo Republic also surpasses many of the other African countries in the fields of education and public health. The Government is spending about one-fourth of its annual budget on education, and school enrollment, encompassing nearly 75 percent of the children of school age, is one of the highest among the French-speaking countries of Africa. The development of medical facilities and a public health program has also been emphasized. The Congo has 2 large hospitals, 13 medical centers, and over 100 dispensaries.

We salute you, President Youlou, and the people of the Congo Republic for your admirable accomplishments since independence. May your future endeavors be equally successful.

Threat to Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 15, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, it is well to remember the words that former President Eisenhower spoke recently in behalf of individual liberty and self-respect. We must be constantly aware and in control of our duties as responsible citizens, least we forsake our privileges to government control. A paternalistic government is no replacement for a government dedicated to democracy. Let us keep in mind the words of Eisenhower as quoted in the New York Mirror editorial of July 4, 1963, under the title "Threat to Liberty," which follows below:

THREAT TO LIBERTY

The "instant liberals" dismissed the speech as the counsel of a fuddy-duddy, but more reflective Americans could do worse than consider, on this anniversary of U.S. independence, some penetrating observations by former President Dwight D. Eisenhower on the general subject of individual liberty and the survival of self-government.

Although Ike spoke on the eve of the centennial commemoration of the Battle of Gettysburg, it was by no means just a "Civil War talk." The issues he raised are philosophically much deeper and broader.

Ike posed a number of searching questions that he suggested all Americans ask themselves. Among them:

"Does self-government, for me, mean sturdy self-reliance—depending upon myself for all those things, tangible and intangible, that I am able, without government interference, to provide myself and my family? Or would I rather take from a paternalistic government every possible immediate advantage it can give, even if I do not really need it?"

"Do I understand that for every responsibility I hope to shift to government I lose something of my individual rights and opportunities?"

The former President agreed that no American would consciously surrender his personal and political integrity, but.

"Bemused by glittering governmental pledges to relieve us of sometimes burdensome responsibilities for self, family and

community, and bewitched by enticing offers of unneeded subsidies, we need constantly to rededicate ourselves to liberty, duty and democracy—never forgetting self-respect."

Well said, Ike. External threats to personal liberty are comparatively easy to spot. Internal threats are trickier, involving as they do the erosion of character and subtle abdication by default.

The Test Ban Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 14, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the Kennedy propaganda machine is in full operation to force acceptance of the test ban treaty by making it unpopular to oppose it. There are those who say it will be political suicide to be against the treaty. Perhaps, but I am not convinced the American people are so easily taken in, even by the publicity experts in the White House.

All of us are for peace. There are few who be for war and certainly we pray that a nuclear holocaust will never be visited upon the world. But even this terrible fate would not compare with the enslavement of the world by the Communists.

Up to this point the Kennedy spokesmen have relied entirely upon arousing the emotions of the people in order to get the test ban accepted. In the briefings and in the hearings now being conducted by the Senate, administration spokesmen shy away from facts. But facts must be presented before we are asked to accept the treaty. We must know that the United States is going to be protected against a doublecross by the Soviet Union, that we are not going to lose our lead in nuclear weapons systems, that we can develop an antimissile missile. None of the experts have presented evidence that we can, but our leading scientists have presented evidence that we cannot.

It is not enough for President Kennedy's spokesmen to tag opponents of the treaty with being for war and against peace. All the facts must be known to the American people and I, for one, intend to keep asking questions and urging thorough investigation before the lives of the American people and other nations are auctioned off on the block of Soviet intrigue.

Two significant articles appeared in the Washington Evening Star of August 14 and I include them here in hope they may arouse others to demand that all sides be heard on this very vital question. The first is by David Lawrence, "Behind the Bright Treaty Facade," and the second by Richard Wilson, "Treaty and Khrushchev's Moods":

BEHIND THE BRIGHT TREATY FACADE: TIGHTENING OF THE IRON CURTAIN IS SEEN IN NEW SOVIET CONTROLS ON INFORMATION

(By David Lawrence)

Because of a superficial acceptance of the emotional cry that world peace is a step nearer by reason of the treaty limiting nu-

clear tests, Nikita Khrushchev and his Communist government are getting applause in many parts of the world, including this country. The dispatches from abroad give the impression that some kind of major step has been taken in the cause of humanity. Many Americans also have been led to believe this, since President Kennedy has called the treaty a "victory for mankind."

But the real news is to be found in the fragmentary disclosures of what goes on inside the totalitarian government in Moscow. A United Press International dispatch last Saturday night escaped general attention. Is it because Communist censorship, too, is accepted now as "normal"? The news item didn't make many front pages. But it contains the key to what's going on behind the Iron Curtain and tells more about the danger of war than do the hackneyed phrases of the treaty on nuclear testing. The dispatch says:

"The Soviet Union took the first concrete step toward a planned reform of information media today by setting up a state committee for the press with a little-known Communist official at its head."

"The plan to tighten control over Russian newspapers and publishing houses has been in the works for several months. It was formally announced during the ideology conference of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee in June."

"The announcement of the new state committee was made in two paragraphs in the government newspaper Izvestia, edited by Premier Nikita Khrushchev's son-in-law, Alexei Adzhubel."

"The June Central Committee meeting on ideology described the Russian press, radio, television and cinema as 'the assault forces of the ideological front.'"

"Under the reform plans, Moscow's 30 national and local newspapers were expected to be cut down sharply with the liquidation of specialized newspapers. But the Izvestia announcement gave no indication whether this plan would be carried out. It was expected the new state committee on the press would concern itself with raising the ideological content of Soviet newspapers and inculcating Russian leaders with Marxist-Leninist philosophy."

It so happens that state committees for radio, television, and the movies have been functioning in Russia for some time. The addition of a state committee for the press, which has just been announced, merely completes the process of concentrated control of all communications media throughout the Soviet Union.

Thus, a nation of 200 million people, as well as the peoples in other Communist-held countries in Eastern Europe, will not only continue to be deprived of much of the news of the rest of the world, but will be given heavy doses of Communist ideology every day in a massive "brainwashing" of the public. With only one political party permitted to have names on the ballot and with elections more or less perfunctory affairs, the dictatorship which holds sway in Moscow can at any moment persuade the people that the West is planning a war, that it is aggressive and may launch a surprise attack, and that hence the duty of the Soviet Union is to strike the "first blow."

This is the heart of the peace-or-war issue, and no amount of treaty-making to prevent a world conflict will be of avail if there is no free communication continuously between the peoples of the East and the West. To draw the Iron Curtain tighter than before and to erect walls and barriers to the flow of truth is to threaten world peace and to relegate to a position of unimportance all the agreements about nuclear testing in the air and in outer space and underwater. Because there is mutual distrust, both the East and the West will continue testing underground and will build bigger and deadlier missiles.

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A5227

The next morning he was confronted by his own newspaper's headlines labeling him a "Fascist" and "Yankee Imperialist," according to Reader's Digest Editors James Monahan and Kenneth O. Gilmore.

Rivero went to the Peruvian Embassy and obtained asylum. That evening on television he watched the final "burial" of the Diario being conducted at the foot of a monument on the campus of the University of Havana.

The Prensa editors bravely published complete details of the destruction of the Diario's freedom and printed an editorial attacking the "gravediggers."

Not unexpectedly, the Communist Revolution responded with headlines screaming the signal to faithful fellow travelers: "Prensa Libre Going the Way of Diario de la Marina."

And it did. A mob gathered. Goon squads seized newsstands' supplies of papers, etc. The mob, including a few Prensa employees, stormed through the plant and took over.

It was May 18, 1960, not even 17 months after Castro was handed Cuba. And the free press was dead.

Distorted Farm Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 15, 1963

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, with the question of agricultural legislation still pending before this Congress, I feel it is timely to call attention to a thoughtful editorial which appeared on August 4, 1963, in the State Journal of Lansing, Mich. This editorial underscores the importance of the American farmer to our economy and I commend it to my colleagues:

DISTORTED FARM IMAGE

Using a Madison Avenue expression, Veril Baldwin, founder of the 1,500-acre Baldwin Farms enterprise near Stockbridge, says he believes there is a great need for improving the image of American agriculture.

Mr. Baldwin insists there are many misconceptions in the public's mind about the role of the farmer in our Nation's economy. Instead of the public's subsidizing agriculture, for instance, he contends that in many instances the farmers are in fact subsidizing the public.

Here is the reason for the reverse twist: While the prices the farmer receives for his products have remained quite constant the past two decades, the prices he pays for machinery, equipment, and other things to keep his farm operating have doubled or more. Mr. Baldwin cites as an instance a tractor, for which he paid \$7,500 a decade ago. Today it would cost \$14,000, he says.

Statistics compiled by the U.S. Department of Agriculture bear out these viewpoints.

Farming has become big business. It requires a much larger investment than was the case not so many years ago. The average farm today involves an outlay of \$42,000 for land, buildings, and equipment. That's seven times what it cost in 1940. But many have more than \$100,000 invested. The average return on the farmer's investment is less than 4 percent.

The trend is toward fewer and larger farms. American farmers are using less than half the manpower and 12 million fewer acres than they did in 1920, but they are

now able to produce nearly twice as much food and fiber for us and the rest of the world. The average farm size increased from 216 acres in 1950 to 302 acres in 1960.

As Mr. Baldwin points out, food is a better buy today than ever before. The consuming public spends a much smaller percentage of its income for food, the quality of which also has improved.

Arthur Mauch, extension specialist in agricultural economics at Michigan State University, says that Americans spend less for food now in relation to our income than in all of our history and less than any other country in the world. In 1947, our \$46 billion food bill took 27 percent of our income, while the \$70 billion spent for this percentage of life in 1959 took only 21 percent of our income.

Mr. Mauch points out that the food bargain is even more striking when compared with the income and food expenditures of the American factory worker. The factory worker now spends only 23 percent of his earnings for food. Only 10 years ago the percentage was 35; 20 years ago, 41; and 30 years ago, 48, or nearly half of his earnings.

Scientists in agriculture have directly improved health and helped cure some of man's oldest ailments. Nutritional diseases, such as goiter, rickets, anemia, pellagra, beriberi, scurvy, and night blindness, were common a few decades ago but now are comparatively rare.

There is no denying that agriculture has a good image as a customer. Dealers in livestock feeds, fertilizers, insecticides, automobiles, trucks, tractors, combines, and other farm equipment appreciate the business they receive from the farmers. American farmers spent about \$27 billion for all the seed, fertilizer, and equipment it took to produce the 1961 crops. In addition, farm families spent \$15 billion for household appliances, homes, medical care, education, vacations, and other things that Americans enjoy.

Yes, agriculture plays a vital role in the national economy. Its importance explains to some extent why there has been so much effort, some of it admittedly misguided, on the part of Congress to support this industry. The Federal Government is now spending about \$7 billion a year in a quite unsatisfactory program aimed at reducing farm surpluses and rural poverty.

Out of the welter of criticisms aimed at the agricultural aid program may come revisions that will offer at least partial solutions for the farm dilemma.

Any step in that direction would be welcome and potentially beneficial to the farmer and public alike. Particularly encouraging would be constructive action to pare down the mountains of surplus farm products and the huge annual Government subsidies.

This would be progress and it would tend to do what Mr. Baldwin suggests is needed. It would be one way of improving the image of American agriculture.

Independence of the Republic of the Congo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 15, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on August 15, the Republic of the Congo celebrates the third anniversary of her independence, and we wish to take this opportunity to send warm felicitations

to His Excellency, the President of the Republic, Fulbert Youlou; and His Excellency, the Congolese Ambassador to the United States, Emmanuel Dadet.

Three years ago the Republic of the Congo—Brazzaville—not to be confused with its sister republic across the river, the former Belgian Congo—achieved independence from France after some 80 years of colonial rule. Its accession to independence was far less turbulent than that of the former Belgian Congo, with the result that in general much less is known about the country, its people, and its progress since independence.

The Congo has been said to be the "least favored by nature" of the countries which formerly comprised French Equatorial Africa, but if this is so, its people have more than made up for any natural barriers to progress by their diligence and determination to build a politically and economically viable republic. Its parliamentary government, headed by its able President, Mr. Fulbert Youlou, has already gained a reputation for stability and realistic planning. With its neighbors—Chad, Gabon, and the Central African Republic—it shares a customs union and has agreed upon procedures and organizations for joint administration and development of regional transportation, communications, fiscal matters, research, and other services. The Congo Republic has become one of the staunchest leaders of movements for African unity, and its capital city, Brazzaville, gave its name to the moderate Brazzaville group of 12 French-speaking states. Its relations with other countries on the African continent and with the world at large have been marked by cooperation and clear-sightedness.

It is true that nature could have been more generous toward the Republic of Congo. The chief livelihood of the people is agriculture, and the inland Niari Basin is a fertile agricultural region. But except for this area, the land is generally unfavorable. The swampy coastline fades into a sandy treeless plain cut off from the fertile interior by a range of forest-covered mountains. The northernmost part of the country is dense rain forest. The Congo has little mineral wealth to be exploited, but in spite of these obstacles the economy is expanding.

Industry is growing, and output now accounts for 11 percent of the country's gross national product. Food processing, lumber and woodworking, shipbuilding, iron and metal works, soap and cigarette manufacture, and the construction industries are presently the most important. The Congo does have one important natural resource—its forest wealth—which is still just being tapped. Timber and timber products accounted for over two-thirds of the Congo's export earnings in 1962.

Although the terrain makes transportation and communications difficult, the Congo has one of the best transportation systems in Africa. The 320-mile Congo-Ocean railroad links its two major cities, the ocean port of Pointe-Noire and the Capital and Congo River port of Brazzaville. This railroad runs through